

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/053,003	01/17/2002	Joseph E. Geusic	1303.042US1	1238
21186	86 7590 04/29/2004		EXAMINER	
SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.			KUNEMUND, ROBERT M	
P.O. BOX 2938 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	,		1765	

DATE MAILED: 04/29/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Advisory Action	10/053,003	GEUSIC ET AL.			
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Robert M Kunemund	1765			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address					
THE REPLY FILED 19 April 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this application (1) a timely filed amendment whi	cation. A proper reply to a ich places the application in			
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]				
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advevent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	visory Action, or (2) the date set forth in th an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The da have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exten 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three more earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sion and the corresponding amount of the d statutory period for reply originally set in	e fee. The appropriate extension fee under the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in			
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.					
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:				
(a) ☑ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);					
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);					
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	terially reducing or simplifying the			
(d) they present additional claims without cance	ling a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.			
NOTE: <u>see note</u> .					
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ction(s):				
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	l be allowable if submitted in a s	separate, timely filed amendment			
	☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: see note.				
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	•				
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:					
Claim(s) allowed:					
Claim(s) objected to:					
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-51</u> .					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	proved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.			
9.⊠ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s). <u>Ocotber 17, 2003</u> .					
10. Other:	$m_{i}(S)$ ($i \in S$) in $i \in S$) in $i \in S$	<u> </u>			
Julian Carlon					
		ROBERT KUNEMUND PRIMARY EXAMINER			

Art Unit: 1765

Attached Note

The proposed amendment will not be entered as the amendment contains new matter. There is no antecedent basis in the specification for the voids being distinct from one another as is now proposed.

Applicants' argument concerning the prior art is noted. However, the examiner admitted in the rejection that the reference does not teach all claimed limitations. However, the missing limitations would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. Applicants have not argued that the limitations are not obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.